Applicant:

McCartney, James I.

Serial No.:

10/604,215

Page 8

## **REMARKS**

The Examiner's objection to claim 4 is respectfully traversed. Applicant has amended claim 4 to depend from claim 1. The Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 7-10 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Baker, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,862,243, hereinafter "Baker") is respectfully traversed. Although, at first glance, it appears that Baker is quite similar to applicant's invention, a thorough analysis reveals otherwise. Baker's invention is for reviewing a batch of bulk mail that has already been printed with names, addresses and bar codes. Therefore, Baker is an off-line system for sampling mail to ensure compliance. The applicant's claimed invention is for a system that is fully integrated into the production (the printing) process so that applicant's invention and method can guarantee compliance with U.S. Post Office standards by shutting down the production process if the output is not compliant. See paragraph 0024 of applicant's invention. Applicant's process is being utilized during the printing process. Claim 1, claim 8 and claim 15 have been amended to clearly distinguish this very important aspect of the system and method in accordance with applicant's invention. In applicant's invention, the method and system can be set up for a hundred percent accuracy. If the Post Office deems that it is not necessary to have a hundred percent accuracy, applicant's method and system can be controlled to stop and correct a sufficient number of pieces of mail to guarantee an accuracy of less than five percent error. A certification can be obtained for the U.S. Post Office based on the sampling error report generated for each run.

For a proper rejection of anticipation, it is elementary patent law that each and every element and method step of the method must be present in a single reference. This is fundamental patent law of 35 U.S.C. 102 anticipation. Clearly, on its face, the Baker reference does not print and check during the same operation. Baker is an off-line batch system for sampling already printed mail to ensure compliance. It lacks the ability to correct the error in

Applicant:

McCartney, James I.

Serial No.:

10/604,215

Page 9

process. The claims, as now amended, show the requirements of the printing step and the checking step during the printing process. Therefore, it is believed that these claims are allowable.

The Examiner's rejection of claims 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over Baker in view Ohkawa, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,462,880) is respectfully traversed.

The deficiencies of Baker have been discussed above.

Ohkawa does not suggest or teach the method claimed by applicant in claims 12-14. Because of the total deficiencies of Baker, even if Baker were combined with Ohkawa, applicant's claimed invention in claims 12-14 would not result.

The Examiner's rejection of claims 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker, et al. in view of Dickson, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,158,659).

The deficiencies of Baker have been discussed above. It is applicant's position that even if Baker were combined with Dickson, et al., applicant's claimed invention as claimed in claims 18 and 19 would not result. Baker lacks too many important elements that are not remotely suggested in Dickson, et al. to result in applicant's claimed invention.

It is believed that applicant's amended claims 1, 8 and 15 clearly recite an invention not remotely suggested in the references cited by the Examiner either as to anticipation or obviousness. The remaining dependent claims now depend from allowable claims.

Applicant:

McCartney, James I.

Serial No.:

10/604,215

Page 10

If there are any additional charges, including Extensions of time, please bill our Deposit Account No. 13-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry L. Haley, Reg. No. 25,339 Malin, Haley & DiMaggio, P.A.

1936 S. Andrews Avenue

Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33316

(954) 763-3303

I:\10210\AMEND\3806.004 Response to 3-24 OA